



One Court of Justice
**Michigan
Supreme Court**

FY 2007 Budget Request





MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

CLIFFORD W. TAYLOR
CHIEF JUSTICE

925 WEST OTTAWA
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48915
PHONE: (517) 373-8635

April 18, 2006

The Honorable Alan Cropsey
Michigan Senate
1005 Farnum Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

The Honorable Cameron Brown
Michigan Senate
205 Farnum Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

The Honorable Valde Garcia
Michigan Senate
S-132 Capitol Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

The Honorable Michael Prusi
Michigan Senate
515 Farnum Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

The Honorable Michael Switalski
Michigan Senate
410 Farnum Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Dear Chairman Cropsey and Members of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Judiciary:

The Michigan Supreme Court is pleased to submit its budget request for Fiscal Year 2007.

Of the judicial branch appropriation, about two-thirds is established and controlled by statute: judicial salaries, payments to local governments, and indigent legal services. The remainder supports judicial branch operations. The Governor's recommended budget calls for a net increase of \$1.7 million for judicial operations, which the Court will use to cover the higher cost of providing health care and retirement. We hope that this net increase will also support a cost of living increase for judiciary employees.

The Governor's original recommended budget does not provide funding for the six new circuit judgeships that have been created in recently signed legislation. However, we understand that the Department of Management and Budget is submitting a revision to the Executive Recommendation to provide additional general fund support of \$719,200 for these new judgeships.

Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Judiciary
April 18, 2006
Page Two


Our budget proposal reports on our progress on several fronts, including that of court technology. For example, through the Judicial Network Project, nearly all felony dispositions are reported electronically to the State Police, with accompanying benefits for law enforcement. Another initiative focuses on developing a web-based case management system for state trial courts. Additional projects include a statewide warehouse of court information, electronic payment of traffic tickets, and electronic filing of court documents.

As in FY 2006, the state's drug treatment court programs would receive a total of \$4.7 million, including \$1.8 million of federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant funds, \$1.9 million from the Justice System Fund, and \$714,500 from the general fund. We are concerned, however, that funding may be reduced or eliminated in the federal government's FY 2007 budget, which would substantially increase drug courts' reliance on state dollars. Michigan currently has 72 drug treatment courts, of which 10 are in the planning stages.

Court collections continue to be a high priority. In 2005, the Court approved a statewide strategy for enforcing and collecting court-ordered financial sanctions. Roll-out of this strategy began in 2005 and is scheduled for completion in 2009.

We appreciate the opportunity to address your committee. Deputy State Court Administrator Dawn Monk (517-373-0128), Budget Officer Karen Ellis (517-373-5544), and Supreme Court Counsel Michael Gadola (517-373-0128) are available if you would like further information or have any questions.

Sincerely,


Clifford W. Taylor
Chief Justice

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Court Technology.....	3
Trial Court Collections.....	5
Drug Treatment Courts.....	6
Justices' and Judges' Salaries.....	10
Economic Adjustments.....	10
Michigan Supreme Court Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request	11

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Introduction

The Michigan Supreme Court recognizes that the State of Michigan faces continuing economic challenges in FY 2007. We will continue to work with the Legislature and the Executive Branch to find ways to reduce costs and increase efficiency while providing for the prompt and orderly administration of justice.

Approximately two-thirds of the state-funded appropriations for the judicial branch are governed by statute: justices' and judges' salaries, payments to local units of government (court equity fund, juror compensation fund, drunk driving case-flow program, and drug case-flow program), and payments to indigent legal services providers.

	Gross	% of Total	GF/GP	% of Total
Total FY 07 Executive Recommendation (000s)	\$258,248.7		\$160,125.4	
Justices' and Judges' Salaries	\$93,540.8	36.21%	\$86,450.6	53.99%
Payments to Local Government	\$78,226.0	30.29%	\$18,635.9	11.64%
Indigent Civil Legal Assistance	\$7,937.0	3.07%	\$0.0	0.00%
Portion of Total Recommendation	\$179,703.8	69.57%	\$105,086.5	65.63%

The remaining one-third is related to judicial branch operations.

	Gross	% of Total	GF/GP	% of Total
Total FY 07 Executive Recommendation (000s)	\$258,248.7		\$160,125.4	
Supreme Court & State Court Administrative Office	\$43,908.0	17.00%	\$23,044.9	14.39%
Court of Appeals	\$19,615.7	7.60%	17,579.4	10.98%
Branchwide Appropriations	\$8,200.0	3.18%	\$8,200.0	5.12%
Judicial Tenure Commission	\$1,023.5	0.40%	\$1,023.5	0.64%
Indigent Defense - Criminal	\$5,797.7	2.25%	\$5,191.1	3.24%
Portion of Total Recommendation	\$78,544.9	30.43%	\$55,038.9	34.37%

The proposed FY 2007 executive budget for the judiciary increases the total general fund by \$2.5 million from the enacted FY 2006 appropriation. This increase includes \$960,200 for justices' and judges' salaries and a net increase of \$1.7 million for judicial operations. The judicial operations funding will be used to cover higher costs for such items as health care and state retirement charges and, we hope, some level of cost of living adjustment for judiciary employees. Judiciary employees did not receive either of the 1 percent cost of living adjustments received by most Executive Branch employees as of October 1, 2005, and April 1, 2006.

Despite difficult financial times, we have continued efforts to improve judicial branch operations and services. Court technology initiatives, Michigan trial court collections, and drug treatment courts are discussed in the following sections of this budget request.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Court Technology

Trial court case management systems play a central role in the timely administration of justice, but integrating those systems statewide is a challenge. Michigan trial courts use 41 different case management systems distributed on 150 different hardware platforms. As a result, courts have difficulty sharing case information with each other and with other branches of government.

Over time, a majority of state trial courts – approximately 77 percent – have come to use or will soon use one of four case management systems developed and maintained by Judicial Information Systems (JIS), a division of the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO). The Court is investigating how to modernize and integrate the four JIS systems. Specific goals include providing a system that:

- Uses web-based technology to modernize case management applications.
- Integrates multiple existing systems into one trial court case management system, allowing for faster development, modification, and deployment.
- Enhances trial court workflow through technology.
- Shares data statewide within the judiciary and with other state agencies.
- Eliminates redundant data and captures required data.
- Improves trial court caseload reporting.
- Reduces ongoing support costs for local trial courts.

The Court is researching whether any existing commercial trial court case management system software will meet the needs of Michigan's courts. At the same time, JIS is determining the requirements for building a new system in a web-based environment. Funding is expected to come from an increase in user fees and from the Judicial Technology Improvement Fund (JTIF). By state statute, 11.10 percent of amounts deposited in the Civil Filing Fee Fund go to JTIF for judicial technology projects. In addition to the trial court case management system, projects funded by JTIF include the judicial network project, the judicial data warehouse, electronic ticket payment, and electronic filing.

Judicial Network Project

Thanks to the Judicial Network Project, which was completed in April 2005, Michigan trial courts now electronically report 96 percent of adult and 95 percent of juvenile felony dispositions to the State Police Criminal History System. Electronic reporting helps to meet federal goals for timely, complete, and accurate reporting of criminal history information. With the Judicial Network Project, courts can update law enforcement information on a daily and often immediate basis, instead of a week or more later. This real-time reporting helps protect the public from crime and also helps ensure that criminals receive fair sentences. JTIF provided funding for the project and provides ongoing support for the network.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

The State Police have an October 2006 deadline for trial courts to submit misdemeanor dispositions electronically. Accordingly, since April 2005, the Judicial Network Project has focused on automating courts for electronic submission of misdemeanor dispositions.

Judicial Data Warehouse

As noted earlier, the judiciary's trial court locations are supported by 41 different case management systems, and these systems are distributed on 150 different hardware platforms. As a result, courts have difficulty sharing case information with each other and with other branches of government. This inability to communicate creates an information void about defendants in criminal cases and others involved in the Michigan justice system.

Starting in 2002, SCAO began using JTIF money to add a judicial data warehouse to the existing state data warehouse. The data warehouse will give state trial judges access to a statewide name index with associated detail data to identify pending and closed cases in other courts. SCAO will be able to generate statistical and trend information from the data warehouse. As of 2005, 89 courts in 34 counties had become part of this project.

In 2005, data from the warehouse was integrated with the State Police I-Services Gateway application, which is a pilot project funded by a Homeland Security Grant. Also interested in similar data sharing projects are the Department of Natural Resources, the State Police Office of Highway Safety and Planning, and the Department of Corrections.

Electronic Ticket Payment

The 62A District Court in Wyoming is the pilot site for the e-ticket payment project and has been in operation since February 2004. The 38th District Court in Eastpointe was added in 2005. The website, <https://e.courts.michigan.gov/>, permits users to:

- post payments to a court's case management system;
- use the state's secure credit card processing application; and
- pay multiple tickets to different courts with one credit card transaction.

In 2005, the project focused on the security of online transactions. Another goal was making sure that the website could accommodate different trial court case management systems. These changes have been completed, and the e-ticket program will be expanded to include additional courts.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Electronic Filing (e-Filing)

Lawyers and laypeople will be able to file court documents from their computers under another judicial branch technology project, known as e-Filing. In 2005, six courts in Michigan offered e-Filing on a limited basis for selective case types.

In the Ottawa Circuit program, attorneys subscribe to an e-Filing service. Documents submitted to the service are printed by the court clerk and then manually processed. Only attorney subscribers and designated court staff have access to the electronic file. In Wayne County, a private vendor provides electronic service of pleadings for the court's asbestos docket. This electronic service has eliminated paper copies of court documents and improved service for all asbestos docket participants.

To make it possible for all state courts to offer e-Filing, in 2004 the Supreme Court began work on an Enterprise e-Filing Manager (EFM). EFM will interface with executive branch agencies and vendors that already provide electronic service of pleadings. In addition to importing data from those sources, EFM will interact and exchange information with all state courts' case and docket management systems.

In November 2004, the 38th District Court in Eastpointe became the first to use EFM for general civil cases. In June 2005, the Michigan Court of Appeals instituted e-Filing for Michigan Public Service Commission cases. In the last quarter of 2005, the Eaton and Oakland County Circuit Courts implemented e-Filing for a select group of cases on their respective dockets.

SCAO's JIS Division will evaluate these pilot projects to determine whether and how to expand e-Filing.

Trial Court Collections

Collecting court-ordered financial sanctions is a top priority for the Michigan judiciary. *Enforcing court orders, including financial sanctions, enhances courts' integrity and credibility.* In addition, as a branch of government, the judiciary is responsible for collecting court fines, fees, and costs. These funds support law enforcement, libraries, the Crime Victims Rights Fund, and local governments. To improve collections, SCAO convened a Collections Advisory Committee in 2004. The Supreme Court approved the committee's recommended collections strategy on June 5, 2005. When this three-phase strategy is complete – in approximately June 2009 – all state trial courts will have a SCAO-mandated collections program. Features include training, data collection, and cost-effective practices. In 2005, the Collections Advisory Committee began statewide communications efforts, including presentations to numerous judges, court administrators, and local government officials. The committee will provide updates to these and other stakeholders as the collections program proceeds. Regional subcommittees, which were convened in 2005, will assist the Collections Advisory Committee in promoting and implementing the collections program.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

In 2005, SCAO took additional steps to improve court collections:

- On-site collections reviews. SCAO and the reviewed courts will use the data to assess the courts' success with collections.
- Improved audit procedures to identify courts for on-site technical assistance.
- New reporting requirements for the courts and case management system providers. Starting on July 15, 2006, courts will provide annual standard receivables and collections reports, which will help SCAO monitor court collections.
- Software enhancements and related training. The software generates mailings to defendants with outstanding balances.
- Prisoner account collections. SCAO matched circuit court cases with nonrestitution balances to a Department of Corrections prisoner file. As a result, circuit courts in 29 counties issued orders to remit prisoner funds.
- Legislation that enhances courts' ability to enforce payment. The legislation, which SCAO supported, also gives courts authority to collect funds from prisoner accounts.
- Development of a simplified process for collecting outstanding fines and costs through the Michigan Department of Treasury, including intercepting state tax refunds.
- Use of the State Data Warehouse to enhance collections.

Drug Treatment Courts

Drug treatment courts have helped nonviolent offenders stop using alcohol and drugs, improve parenting skills, obtain employment, and lead productive lives. Drug treatment court features include: graduated sanctions, random mandatory drug testing, judicially supervised treatment, and aftercare programs. In addition to addressing the offender's addiction, drug treatment courts work with community agencies to provide education, employment, and other services for drug court participants. Michigan currently has 72 drug treatment courts, including 33 adult, 4 family dependency, 17 DUI, 14 juvenile and 4 tribal. Ten of the 72 drug courts are in the planning phase.

The judiciary's \$4.7 million FY 2006 appropriation for drug treatment courts includes \$1.8 million from the federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne), \$1.9 million from the Justice System Fund, and \$714,500 from the general fund. SCAO's Michigan Drug Court Grant Program (MDCGP) administers state and federal sources of drug court funding. Michigan's Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP) has also provided an additional \$1.1 million of Byrne funds for FY 2006. With this combined funding of \$5.8 million, 45 drug treatment court programs have to date been awarded grants totaling \$4.8 million for FY 2006, as

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

shown on the table on the next two pages. The Governor's recommended budget for FY 2007 also includes \$4.7 million for drug treatment courts. However, it is possible that Byrne funding may be reduced or eliminated in the federal government's FY 2007 budget, which would mean the loss of some or all of both the \$1.8 million in the judiciary's budget and the \$1.1 million through ODCP.

Federal Byrne funding supports a joint effort by the courts, the Department of Corrections, and ODCP to avoid prison for nonviolent offenders. Byrne funding targets nonviolent probation violators and other nonviolent felony offenders who, based on local sentencing practices, are otherwise bound for prison; the long-term goal is to reduce drug use and recidivism among this population of offenders.

Drug Court Case Management

2004 PA 224 called for SCAO to gauge the effectiveness of Michigan's drug treatment courts. Accordingly, in 2005, SCAO entered into a contract to develop an automated case management information system, known as the Drug Court Case Management Information System (DCCMIS). Using DCCMIS, drug courts will manage their caseloads, as well as provide individual data on each drug court applicant and participant as required by the legislation.

DCCMIS is a web-based, menu-driven application organized around a series of screens associated with a client's case. Most users will not require any special computer expertise to navigate the system. Drug treatment courts who receive MDCGP funding will be required to use DCCMIS; in addition, DCCMIS will be available to all drug treatment courts, regardless of whether they receive state funding. SCAO will maintain DCCMIS and train users; there will be no local cost to use the application. The first group of courts began implementing DCCMIS in January 2006.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Court	SCAO Byrne Award	SCAO MDCGP Awards	ODCP Byrne Award	Total 2006 Awards
Barry County Barry County Trial - Adult Barry County Trial - Juvenile	\$91,666	\$78,000 \$70,000	\$60,000	\$169,666 \$130,000
Bay County 74 th District, Bay City - DUI	\$146,413	\$40,000		\$186,413
Calhoun County 37 th Circuit - Adult	\$119,433	\$40,000		\$159,433
Eaton County 56 th Circuit - DUI		\$40,000	\$40,453	\$80,453
Emmet County 57 th Circuit - Juvenile		\$60,000		\$60,000
Genesee County 7 th Circuit - Adult 7 th Circuit - Family Dependency 67 th District - DUI	\$150,000	\$50,000 \$15,000 \$16,000	\$18,286	\$200,000 \$15,000 \$34,286
Grand Traverse County 13 th Circuit - Juvenile 86 th District, Traverse City - DUI		\$37,000 \$65,000	\$31,395 \$50,000	\$68,395 \$115,000
Ingham County 54A District - Adult 55 th District - DUI		\$23,000 \$60,000	\$70,000	\$23,000 \$130,000
Iron County 41 st Circuit - DUI		\$30,000	\$38,995	\$68,995
Isabella County Isabella County Trial - Adult Isabella County Trial - Juvenile		\$20,000	\$54,112	\$54,112 \$20,000
Jackson County 4 th Circuit - Adult		\$83,000		\$83,000
Kalamazoo County 9 th Circuit - Adult	\$187,035	\$95,000		\$282,035
Kent County 61 st District, Grand Rapids - Adult	\$245,600	\$90,000		\$335,600
Livingston County 44 th Circuit - Adult	\$81,315	\$20,000		\$101,315
Macomb County 16 th Circuit - Adult 16 th Circuit - Juvenile 37 th District, Warren - Adult	\$175,000 \$160,000	\$40,000 \$40,000 \$40,000	\$50,000	\$215,000 \$90,000 \$200,000
Manistee County 19 th Circuit - Juvenile		\$20,000	\$39,171	\$59,171
Monroe County 38 th Circuit - Juvenile		\$80,000		\$80,000
Oakland County 6 th Circuit - Adult 6 th Circuit - Juvenile 43 rd District, Ferndale - DUI 46 th District, Southfield - DUI 47 th District, Farmington Hills - DUI 51 st District, Waterford - DUI 52-1 District, Novi - DUI 52-2 District, Clarkston - DUI 52-4 District, Troy - DUI	\$137,500	\$30,000 \$100,000 \$5,000 \$35,000 \$20,000 \$40,000 \$35,000 \$50,000 \$35,000	\$124,776 \$10,332 \$41,136 \$29,866 \$30,000	\$167,500 \$224,776 \$15,332 \$76,136 \$20,000 \$69,866 \$65,000 \$50,000 \$35,000

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Court	SCAO Byrne Award	SCAO MDCGP Awards	ODCP Byrne Award	Total 2006 Awards
Ottawa County				
20 th Circuit – Adult		\$80,000		\$80,000
20 th Circuit - Juvenile		\$34,000	\$39,123	\$73,123
58 th District – DUI		\$75,000		\$75,000
Washtenaw County				
15 th District - DUI		\$60,000		\$60,000
Washtenaw County Trial Court - Juvenile		\$33,000		\$33,000
Wayne County				
3 rd Circuit - Adult	\$155,029	\$95,000		\$250,029
3 rd Circuit – Juvenile		\$44,000	\$180,000	\$224,000
19 th District, Dearborn – Adult		\$35,000	\$41,082	\$76,082
23 rd District, Taylor – Adult		\$25,000	\$64,000	\$89,000
28 th District, Southgate - Adult			\$70,000	\$70,000
36 th District, Detroit – Adult		\$40,000	\$56,000	\$96,000
TOTAL	\$1,648,991	\$2,023,000	\$1,138,727	\$4,810,718

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Justices' and Judges' Salaries

The Governor's recommended budget includes a net increase of \$960,200 in justices' and judges' salaries. The increase covers the conversion of seven part-time probate judges to full-time effective January 2, 2007, and provides for judges' defined contribution and social security payroll tax costs.

The Governor signed bills in April 2006 to create six new circuit judgeships effective January 1, 2007. Funding for these new judgeships was not included in the original recommended budget; however, we have been told that the administration intends to find the additional funding necessary for this commitment. An additional \$719,200 of general fund would be required to fund nine months of salary for six circuit court judgeships.

Another potential FY 2007 issue relates to whether there will be sufficient funds to pay justices' and judges' salaries. By statute, a portion of Civil Filing Fee Fund revenues is allocated to the Judges' Retirement System (JRS); any funds that JRS does not need go to the Court Fee Fund. For several years, JRS has not needed revenues from the Civil Filing Fee Fund; accordingly, those revenues have gone to the Court Fee Fund for judicial salaries. However, the FY 2006 actuarial valuation determined that JRS needs to retain a portion of these funds in FY 2006, and the same will probably be true in FY 2007. Whether or not there will be a shortfall in the Court Fee Fund will depend on the results of the FY 2007 actuarial valuation and revenue collections in the Civil Filing Fee Fund. Section 308 of the boilerplate in the Governor's executive budget bill provides that, if there is a shortfall, additional general fund shall be appropriated for judicial salaries.

Economic Adjustments

The Governor's recommended budget includes general fund increases of \$1,950,600 (\$2,057,300 gross) for employee economics (salary, insurances, and retirement). The recommended budget also includes general fund increases of \$46,800 for building occupancy (\$146,000 gross) and \$53,300 for private rent and general fund program reductions of \$500,000.

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

Michigan Supreme Court Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

	ENACTED 2005-2006	JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2007
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY:		
Full-time equated exempted positions 509.0		
GROSS APPROPRIATION	255,381,900	258,248,700
Total interdepartmental grants	2,563,500	2,563,500
ADJUSTED GROSS APPROPRIATION	252,818,400	255,685,200
Total federal revenues	3,926,400	3,926,400
Special revenue funds:		
Total local revenues	3,419,100	3,612,400
Total private revenues	842,500	842,500
Total other restricted revenues	87,015,900	87,178,500
State general fund/general purpose	157,614,500	160,125,400
SUPREME COURT		
Full-time equated exempted positions 235.0		
Supreme Court Administration, 97.0 FTE positions	11,065,700	11,361,800
Judicial Institute, 16.0 FTE positions	2,719,300	2,756,500
State Court Administrative Office, 62.0 FTE positions	10,393,200	10,562,100
Judicial Information Systems, 18.0 FTE positions	2,543,400	2,591,100
Direct Trial Court Automation Support, 26.0 FTE positions	3,419,100	3,612,400
Foster Care Review Board, 12.0 FTE positions	1,248,600	1,277,800
Community Dispute Resolution Program, 4.0 FTE positions	2,264,700	2,277,300
Drug Treatment Courts	4,735,000	4,729,000
Other Federal Grants	275,000	275,000
GROSS APPROPRIATION	38,664,000	39,443,000
Appropriated from:		
Interdepartmental grant revenues:		
IDG from department of community health	1,800,000	1,800,000
IDG from department of career development	40,000	40,000
IDG from state police—Michigan justice training fund	300,000	300,000
Federal revenues:		
DOJ—victims assistance program	50,000	50,000
DOJ—drug court training and evaluation	300,000	300,000
DOT—national highway safety traffic administration	100,000	100,000
HHS—access and visitation grant	387,000	387,000
HHS—court improvement project	1,160,000	1,160,000
HHS—children's justice grant	206,300	206,300
HHS—title IV-D child support program	907,700	907,700
HHS—title IV-E foster care program	540,400	540,400
Other federal grants	275,000	275,000

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

	ENACTED 2005-2006	JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2007
SUPREME COURT (continued)		
Special revenue funds:		
Local—user fees	3,419,100	3,612,400
Private	169,000	169,000
Private—interest on lawyers trust accounts	232,700	232,700
Private—state justice institute	370,800	370,800
Community dispute resolution fees	2,264,700	2,277,300
Law exam fees	482,100	482,100
Drug court fund	1,920,500	1,920,500
Miscellaneous revenue	227,900	227,900
Justice system fund	700,000	700,000
State court fund	339,000	339,000
State general fund/general purpose	22,471,800	23,044,900
COURT OF APPEALS		
Full-time equated exempted positions 212.0 Operations, 212.0 FTE positions	18,653,000	19,615,700
GROSS APPROPRIATION	18,653,000	19,615,700
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Court filing/motion fees	1,808,500	1,958,500
Miscellaneous revenue	77,800	77,800
State general fund/general purpose	16,766,700	17,579,400
BRANCHWIDE APPROPRIATIONS		
Full-time equated exempted positions 4.0 Branchwide appropriations, 4.0 FTE positions	8,042,300	8,200,000
GROSS APPROPRIATION	8,042,300	8,200,000
Appropriated from:		
State general fund/general purpose	8,042,300	8,200,000

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

	ENACTED 2005-2006	JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2007
JUSTICES' AND JUDGES' COMPENSATION		
Full-time judges' positions 613.0		
Supreme court justices' salaries, 7.0 justices	1,152,300	1,152,300
Court of appeals judges' salaries, 28.0 judges	4,240,300	4,240,300
District court judges' state base salaries, 258.0 judges	23,877,200	23,877,200
District court judicial salary standardization	11,796,800	11,796,800
Probate court judges' state base salaries, 103.0 judges	9,108,600	9,498,100
Probate court judicial salary standardization	4,389,800	4,599,700
Circuit court judges' state base salaries, 217.0 judges	20,440,400	20,440,400
Circuit court judicial salary standardization	9,922,100	9,922,100
Judges' retirement system defined contributions	2,919,200	3,065,200
OASI, social security	4,733,900	4,948,700
GROSS APPROPRIATION	92,580,600	93,540,800
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:	7,090,200	7,090,200
Court fee fund	85,490,400	86,450,600
State general fund/general purpose		
JUDICIAL AGENCIES		
Full-time equated exempted positions 8.0		
Judicial tenure commission, 8.0 FTE positions	1,049,500	1,023,500
GROSS APPROPRIATION	1,049,500	1,023,500
Appropriated from:		
State general fund/general purpose	1,049,500	1,023,500
INDIGENT DEFENSE—CRIMINAL		
Full-time equated exempted positions 50.0		
Appellate public defender program, 42.0 FTE positions	4,764,500	4,903,500
Appellate assigned counsel administration, 8.0 FTE positions	869,900	894,200
GROSS APPROPRIATION	5,634,400	5,797,700
Appropriated from:		
Interdepartmental grant revenues:		
IDG from state police—Michigan justice training fund	423,500	423,500
Special revenue funds:		
Private—interest on lawyers trust accounts	70,000	70,000
Miscellaneous revenue	113,100	113,100
State general fund/general purpose	5,027,800	5,191,100
INDIGENT LEGAL ASSISTANCE—CIVIL		
Indigent legal civil assistance	7,937,000	7,937,000
GROSS APPROPRIATION	7,937,000	7,937,000
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
State court fund	7,937,000	7,937,000
State general fund/general purpose	0	0

FY 2007 Budget Request - Michigan Supreme Court

	ENACTED 2005-2006	JUDICIARY PROPOSED AND GOVERNOR'S REC. FY 2007
TRIAL COURT OPERATIONS		
Court equity fund reimbursements	69,206,000	69,075,900
Judicial technology improvement fund	4,465,000	4,465,000
GROSS APPROPRIATION	73,671,000	73,540,900
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Court equity fund	50,440,000	50,440,000
Judicial technology improvement fund	4,465,000	4,465,000
State general fund/general purpose	18,766,000	18,635,900
GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT		
Drunk driving case-flow program	2,300,000	2,300,000
Drug case-flow program	250,000	250,000
Juror compensation reimbursement	6,600,000	6,600,000
Transcript fee reimbursement	100	100
GROSS APPROPRIATION	9,150,100	9,150,100
Appropriated from:		
Special revenue funds:		
Drunk driving fund	2,300,000	2,300,000
Drug fund	250,000	250,000
Juror compensation fund	6,600,000	6,600,000
Transcript fee fund	100	100
State general fund/general purpose	0	0